Journal of the Knowledge Economy
https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-024-01986-x

Innovation Ecosystems: A Cross-Industry Examination of Knowledge Flows and Collaboration Dynamics

Mingyang Nan[1] **· Longyang Huang**[2]

Received: 24 January 2024 / Accepted: 10 April 2024

Abstract
This comprehensive study investigates the intricate dynamics of knowledge flows and collaboration within the innovation ecosystem of the United Kingdom, employing a concurrent embedded design that integrates qualitative and quantitative methods. By examining facilitators, impediments, and industry-specific influences, the research provides nuanced insights into the multifaceted nature of innovation ecosystems. Triangulating qualitative and quantitative findings, the study reveals the critical roles of trust, effective communication, and network density in fostering knowledge exchange. Exploration of diverse collaboration forms, from formal partnerships to mentorship programs, underscores their prevalence and impact on innovation outcomes. The study advances existing literature by offering a cross-industry perspective, introducing a novel theoretical framework, and providing empirically grounded recommendations for cultivating more effective and impactful innovation ecosystems. While acknowledging certain limitations, such as the focus on a specific geographical context, the study significantly contributes to our understanding of these dynamic environments, offering a foundation for future research and practical guidance for stakeholders involved in fostering innovation.

Keywords Innovation ecosystems · Knowledge flows · Collaboration dynamics · Empirical research · Cross-industry perspective · Triangulation methodology

Introduction

In the vast and intricate tapestry of technological progress, the warp and weft are woven with threads of knowledge and collaboration, giving rise to the complex patterns of innovation ecosystems (Bacon et al., 2020). These ecosystems, resembling

✉ Longyang Huang
hlycquu@163.com

[1] School of Marxism, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan 430074, China

[2] School of Public Policy and Administration, Chongqing University, Chongqing 400044, China

Published online: 23 April 2024

interconnected networks akin to a finely tuned symphony, bring together diverse players such as universities, businesses, investors, and government agencies (Visnjic et al., 2016; Reeves & Pidun, 2022). In their collaborative dance, they create a fertile ground where revolutionary ideas not only take root but also flourish into transformative technologies that have the potential to reshape the very fabric of our existence. As the bedrock of knowledge creation, universities contribute the warp to this intricate tapestry. They are the repositories of intellectual capital, pushing the boundaries of what is known and challenging the status quo (Serenko & Bontis, 2022). Within innovation ecosystems, universities become vibrant hubs where ideas germinate, research flourishes, and the foundations for groundbreaking discoveries are laid. The exchange of knowledge within these academic institutions sets the stage for the collaborative journey (Sharma & Meyer, 2019).

On the other hand, businesses provide the weft, intertwining their practical insights and market-driven perspectives with the theoretical knowledge generated by universities (Duxbury et al., 2023). Their involvement in innovation ecosystems is multifaceted, from direct partnerships with academic institutions to fostering entrepreneurial endeavors. As the weft, businesses bring a pragmatic dimension to theoretical innovations, ensuring that ideas are visionary and commercially viable (Carayannis et al., 2022). This collaboration between knowledge creators and industry practitioners is a symbiotic relationship that propels innovation beyond the realms of academia and into the real-world applications that shape industries and societies. Investors inject the necessary resources into the warp and weft, serving as catalysts for the transformation of ideas into tangible innovations (Pandiarajan, 2022). Their financial support fuels research endeavors, facilitates prototype development, and enables successful project scaling. In the intricate dance of innovation ecosystems, investors play a crucial role in determining which threads of ideas will be woven into the fabric of the future, amplifying the impact of innovation on a broader scale (Ireta Sanchez, 2023).

Government agencies, both patrons and regulators, contribute to the structural integrity of the innovation tapestry. Policies, funding initiatives, and regulatory frameworks shape the environment in which innovation ecosystems operate. Their role is akin to that of a master weaver, ensuring that the threads of progress are woven together to align with broader societal goals and fostering responsible innovation that addresses pressing challenges (Rong et al., 2022). The exchange of knowledge and cross-pollination of expertise within these dynamic ecosystems have far-reaching implications. It goes beyond the mere advancement of technology; it actively propels entire industries forward. This collaborative synergy becomes the engine that drives economic growth, job creation, and the development of solutions to complex global challenges (Thirumalesh Madanaguli et al., 2021).

Moreover, innovation ecosystems actively contribute to shaping the future we inhabit. The transformative technologies that emerge from these collaborative endeavors impact various facets of our lives, from healthcare and education to transportation and communication. The ripple effects extend to societal structures, economic systems, and the way we interact with the world (Klein, 2021). Recent statistics highlight the indispensable role that innovation ecosystems play in shaping the global landscape. A 2023 report by the Global Innovation Index

establishes a direct correlation between a vibrant ecosystem and a nation's economic prosperity. Countries with robust innovation ecosystems, characterized by strong partnerships, ample funding, and a wealth of skilled talent, consistently outperform their counterparts on critical metrics such as GDP per capita and patent generation (Bakshi & Biswas, 2023). The World Economic Forum echoes this sentiment, emphasizing that thriving ecosystems significantly address global challenges, ranging from climate change mitigation to sustainable healthcare solutions (Huntjens, 2021).

Nevertheless, despite the evident importance of innovation ecosystems, critical knowledge gaps persist regarding the intricate dance of knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics within these diverse environments. Existing research has shed light on individual components, such as the role of universities in technology transfer, the impact of venture capital investment, and the significance of government policies. However, a holistic understanding of how these elements synergize to create an innovative environment remains in its infancy. This research gap impedes our ability to effectively cultivate and optimize innovation ecosystems, limiting their full potential to spur transformative breakthroughs. This study aims to bridge this critical gap by undertaking a comprehensive cross-industry examination of knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics within innovation ecosystems. Drawing upon in-depth case studies of thriving ecosystems across various industries—from biotechnology to fintech—we delve into the intricate interplay between knowledge-generating institutions, commercialization pathways, and collaborative networks.

Therefore, the objectives seek to contribute significantly to the field:

- *Identify key facilitators and impediments to knowledge flow within innovation ecosystems:* The study endeavors to uncover the factors that facilitate or hinder the seamless flow of knowledge within these dynamic environments. A nuanced understanding of these dynamics is crucial for developing strategies to enhance the efficiency of knowledge transfer.
- *Map the diverse forms of collaboration and their impact on innovation outcomes:* Collaboration takes various forms within innovation ecosystems, ranging from university-industry partnerships to cross-sector collaborations. This research explores these diverse collaborative structures and analyzes their impact on innovation outcomes, whether in terms of new technologies, products, or services.
- *Evaluate the influence of industry-specific factors on knowledge exchange and collaboration dynamics:* Acknowledging that each industry has its unique characteristics, the study assesses how industry-specific factors influence knowledge exchange and collaboration dynamics within innovation ecosystems.
- *Develop empirically grounded recommendations for nurturing more effective and impactful innovation ecosystems*: The ultimate goal is to provide actionable recommendations based on empirical evidence. These recommendations will empower stakeholders to strategically develop and optimize future innovation ecosystems, ensuring they reach their full potential in driving groundbreaking advancements.

The subsequent sections of this paper will unfold our meticulously crafted journey to illuminate the complex world of innovation ecosystems. We initiate this voyage by establishing a theoretical framework that forms the foundation for our analysis. Following this, we present a detailed methodology outlining our case study selection and data collection procedures. The core of our analysis lies in the presentation and interpretation of findings, where we unveil the dynamic dance of knowledge flows and collaboration within each industry-specific ecosystem.

Related Works

Theoretical Underpinnings

In navigating the complex terrain of innovation ecosystems, our study aims to unravel the intricate tapestry of knowledge exchange and collaborative forces that propel transformative breakthroughs. By contributing significantly to this burgeoning field, we seek to illuminate the multifaceted dynamics within these vibrant networks. Our theoretical underpinnings are anchored in established frameworks and concepts, guiding our exploration of knowledge flows, collaboration patterns, and industry-specific nuances. The ultimate goal is to distill actionable recommendations for nurturing more effective and impactful ecosystems. The nuanced understanding of knowledge flows within innovation ecosystems is central to our investigation. We build upon the foundational knowledge spillover theory pioneered by economists such as Arrow (1962) and Romer (1990). This theory posits that knowledge generated by one entity can spill over to benefit others within spatial or economic proximity, providing a conceptual framework for elucidating the movement of knowledge across various ecosystem actors, including universities, research institutions, startups, and established companies (Audretsch & Lehmann, 2022). However, our exploration delves beyond proximity, recognizing that mere spatial closeness does not guarantee effective knowledge absorption. In alignment with the work of Cohen and Levinthal, we introduce the concept of absorptive capacity. This concept delineates an organization's ability to identify, assimilate, and utilize external knowledge, shedding light on the internal factors that shape how different ecosystem actors leverage the knowledge around them (Gann, 2001).

Innovation seldom occurs in isolation; collaboration takes center stage within ecosystems. Here, we draw upon network theory to comprehend the intricate relationships fostering these partnerships. Granovetter's (1973) concept of weak ties becomes particularly relevant, emphasizing the importance of connections beyond close-knit groups. These bridges expose actors to diverse knowledge and perspectives, serving as catalysts for innovation. Our study aims to map the various forms of collaboration within different ecosystems, encompassing formal partnerships, informal interactions, and knowledge exchange facilitated by intermediaries like brokers or incubators. Acknowledging the dynamic nature of these networks, we incorporate the concept of network evolution (Nooteboom et al., 2007). Innovation ecosystems are not static entities; they continually adapt and evolve as new actors join, relationships form and dissolve, and knowledge

flows shift. Our analysis considers how these evolving networks influence the overall innovation outcomes of the ecosystem.

Recognizing each industry's unique characteristics, we integrate insights from institutional theory (Lawrence & Shadnam, 2008) into our framework, which allows us to delve into the industry-specific factors shaping knowledge exchange and collaboration dynamics. Formal and informal institutions, such as regulatory frameworks, intellectual property regimes, and industry norms, significantly influence how knowledge is shared and collaboration unfolds within these ecosystems (Oguamanam, 2013).

Moreover, we acknowledge the role of path dependence in shaping innovation trajectories within specific industries. Historical developments and established practices can create path dependencies, influencing the types of knowledge valued, the preferred modes of collaboration, and the challenges faced in knowledge exchange (Crupi et al., 2021). Our analysis encompasses how these industry-specific factors interact with the broader knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics within each ecosystem. Ultimately, our research endeavors to contribute to the strategic development and optimization of future innovation ecosystems. To ensure practical relevance, we draw upon action research methodologies (Brydon-Miller & Maguire, 2009). This approach ensures that our findings transcend theoretical realms and translate into actionable recommendations for stakeholders. By grounding our analysis in empirical evidence and considering the industry-specific context, we strive to provide practical strategies for enhancing knowledge flows, fostering effective collaboration, and addressing unique challenges faced by different ecosystems. Our goal is to empower stakeholders to actively shape the trajectory of innovation, driving impactful outcomes in an ever-evolving landscape.

The proposed framework for understanding knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics within innovation ecosystems is anchored in established theories such as knowledge spillover theory and absorptive capacity while integrating industry-specific factors and network theory. It recognizes the pivotal role of knowledge spillovers in facilitating the movement of knowledge across various ecosystem actors and emphasizes an organization's absorptive capacity in leveraging external knowledge effectively. Drawing upon network theory, the framework highlights the importance of diverse connections and evolving network structures in fostering collaboration and driving innovation outcomes. Moreover, by incorporating industry-specific factors such as institutional frameworks and path dependence, the framework offers a comprehensive understanding of how knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics interact within specific contexts. Ultimately, this integrated framework provides stakeholders with actionable insights for enhancing collaboration efforts and navigating the complexities of innovation ecosystems in an ever-evolving landscape.

Knowledge Flows and Absorption Capacities

Knowledge flow and absorption dynamics are paramount in the intricate tapestry of innovation ecosystems, constituting the lifeblood of transformative breakthroughs. Understanding the various types of knowledge flow, the mechanisms that facilitate it, and the influencing factors is essential for unlocking the full potential of

collaborative environments. Formal knowledge flow within innovation ecosystems takes on structured and planned forms, encompassing official collaborations, joint ventures, or contractual agreements (Järvi et al., 2018). In contrast, informal knowledge flow is characterized by spontaneous and unstructured interactions through casual conversations or unplanned engagements. The synergy between these formal and informal channels contributes to the richness and diversity of knowledge within the ecosystem (Morrison-Smith & Ruiz, 2020).

The exchange of implicit and explicit knowledge is fundamental to innovation ecosystems. Tacit knowledge, deeply embedded in individuals' experiences and expertise, is often shared through personal interactions, mentorship, and hands-on experiences (Bacon et al., 2020). Explicit knowledge, codified and documented, finds expression in reports, manuals, and databases. Striking a balance between tacit and explicit knowledge flow is crucial for comprehensive knowledge exchange within innovation ecosystems, ensuring a holistic transfer of practical skills and codified information (Vaccaro et al., 2009). Vertical knowledge flow occurs between different hierarchical levels within an organization, involving the exchange of insights from leadership to employees or vice versa. Effective vertical knowledge flow ensures that strategic goals and visions are communicated throughout the organization, aligning the efforts of all members (Grant, 1996). Horizontal knowledge flow transpires between peers or entities at similar organizational levels, facilitating collaboration and enabling individuals to share expertise, best practices, and lessons learned (Santoro et al., 2006). Knowledge can traverse both inter-organizational and intra-organizational boundaries within innovation ecosystems. Inter-organizational knowledge flow involves entities from different organizations collaborating and sharing insights, leading to synergistic partnerships (Rehm & Goel, 2015). Intra-organizational knowledge flow focuses on knowledge exchange within the same organization, enhancing efficiency, innovation, and the organization's collective intelligence (Paruchuri & Awate, 2017).

Knowledge spillovers occur when knowledge generated by one entity inadvertently benefits others within spatial or economic proximity. This mechanism aligns with the knowledge spillover theory pioneered by economists like Arrow (1962) and Romer (1990). Innovation ecosystems, by their collaborative nature, are conducive to knowledge spillovers, contributing to the overall richness and diversity of the ecosystem (Prokop & Stejskal, 2018). University-industry partnerships represent a formalized mechanism for knowledge exchange involving collaborative research projects, joint ventures, or technology transfer agreements. These partnerships bridge the gap between academia and industry, facilitating the translation of research findings into tangible innovations (De Wit-de Vries et al., 2019).

Conferences and publications serve as platforms for the dissemination of knowledge within innovation ecosystems. Academic conferences provide opportunities for researchers, entrepreneurs, and industry professionals to share their findings, exchange ideas, and establish connections. Peer-reviewed publications contribute to the formal documentation of explicit knowledge, playing a pivotal role in knowledge exchange (Gawer & Cusumano, 2014). The mobility of researchers and entrepreneurs is a dynamic mechanism for knowledge flow. Individuals moving between academia, industry, and entrepreneurial ventures bring diverse experiences and insights. This mobility enhances the cross-pollination of

ideas and facilitates the transfer of tacit knowledge, contributing to the vibrancy of innovation ecosystems (Wright et al., 2018).

Absorptive capacity refers to an organization's ability to identify, assimilate, and utilize external knowledge. It is a critical factor influencing how effectively different actors within an innovation ecosystem can leverage the knowledge around them. Organizations with high absorptive capacity can more readily integrate external knowledge into their existing practices, fostering innovation and adaptability (Camisón & Forés, 2010). Trust and social ties are foundational elements in knowledge absorption. In a collaborative ecosystem, trust facilitates open communication and the sharing of sensitive or proprietary information. Social ties, both formal and informal, contribute to the creation of a network where individuals feel comfortable sharing their knowledge (Yli-Renko et al., 2001).

Cultural factors significantly influence knowledge absorption, including organizational culture and the broader cultural context. An organizational culture that values continuous learning, experimentation, and risk-taking is more likely to absorb and apply new knowledge (Zheng et al., 2010). The broader cultural context, including societal attitudes toward innovation, can influence how readily external knowledge is embraced and integrated. The effectiveness of communication channels is a pivotal factor in knowledge absorption. Transparent and open communication channels, both formal and informal, facilitate the seamless exchange of knowledge. Well-established communication protocols ensure that information flows efficiently within the ecosystem, preventing bottlenecks and promoting collaboration (Mu et al., 2010). Infrastructure, encompassing both physical and technological aspects, influences knowledge absorption. Adequate technological infrastructure supports the efficient sharing of explicit knowledge through digital platforms and collaborative tools (Khan & Tao, 2022). Physical infrastructure, such as research facilities and innovation hubs, creates spaces where individuals can interact, share ideas, and engage in collaborative activities, enhancing knowledge absorption (Cuvero et al., 2023).

Empirical studies play a crucial role in understanding how knowledge flows and absorption operate within diverse industry contexts. These studies provide insights into the real-world dynamics of innovation ecosystems and contribute valuable evidence for the development of effective strategies (Aliasghar et al., 2023). Examples of empirical research in this domain include investigations into the knowledge exchange mechanisms prevalent in biotechnology, information technology, healthcare, and manufacturing sectors. Through rigorous examination and analysis, empirical studies contribute to a deeper understanding of the complexities of knowledge dynamics within specific industries, informing strategies for optimized knowledge flow and absorption (Secundo et al., 2019).

Collaboration Dynamics and Network Theory

In the intricate realm of innovation ecosystems, collaboration dynamics and network theory play pivotal roles in shaping transformative breakthroughs. This discourse aims to delve into various forms of collaboration, the roles played by different

actors, the impact of network structures on innovation, and empirical studies shedding light on collaboration dynamics within specific innovation ecosystems. Formal partnerships involve structured agreements between entities, laying the foundation for collaborative efforts (Bauer et al., 2022; Keane & Costin, 2019). These can take the form of strategic alliances, research partnerships, or co-development initiatives. Such collaborations often bring together the strengths and resources of each party, fostering synergies for mutual benefit. Joint ventures represent a more intensive form of collaboration where two or more entities pool their resources to create a separate entity for a specific project or venture, which allows for shared risks and rewards, encouraging a deep level of collaboration in pursuit of common goals (Nippa & Reuer, 2019). Strategic alliances involve cooperative agreements between entities that may remain independent but collaborate to achieve specific objectives. These alliances span various domains, including technology development, market expansion, or joint research initiatives, providing flexibility while fostering collaboration (Castañer & Oliveira, 2020). Informal collaborations are spontaneous interactions and knowledge exchanges that occur without structured agreements. These often happen through informal networks within and between organizations, facilitating quick and dynamic collaboration responsive to emerging opportunities (Villani & Phillips, 2021). Open innovation platforms provide a structured framework for external entities, such as startups, to contribute ideas, technologies, or solutions to larger organizations. These platforms embrace external input as a source of innovation, promoting collaboration beyond traditional organizational boundaries (Abbate et al., 2019). Knowledge networks are interconnected systems that facilitate the exchange of information, expertise, and resources. These networks can be formal or informal, involving universities, research institutions, businesses, and other entities. Knowledge networks amplify the collaborative potential by creating interconnected hubs of intellectual capital (Dahesh et al., 2020).

Universities serve as hubs of knowledge creation and play a crucial role in collaboration by contributing cutting-edge research, fostering innovation through academic-industry partnerships, and facilitating knowledge transfer from academia to the broader ecosystem (Nawaz & Koç, 2020). Startups inject entrepreneurial spirit into collaboration dynamics. Their agility, innovative ideas, and willingness to take risks make them valuable contributors to collaborative endeavors. Startups often bring fresh perspectives and disruptive technologies to the ecosystem. Established companies' resources and market experience contribute stability and scalability to collaborations (Sehnem et al., 2022). They often engage in partnerships with startups or universities to harness innovative solutions and maintain competitiveness in the ever-evolving landscape. Government agencies play a pivotal role in shaping collaboration dynamics by providing funding, regulatory support, and incentives for collaborative initiatives. They act as catalysts for fostering innovation, particularly in areas of national interest or societal impact (Kolade et al., 2022). Intermediaries, such as innovation hubs, accelerators, or industry associations, act as facilitators in collaboration. They connect diverse actors, provide platforms for interaction, and streamline the collaborative process. Intermediaries contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of collaboration within the innovation ecosystem (Noviaristanti et al., 2023).

The strength of ties within a network influences the depth and intensity of collaboration. Strong ties imply close relationships, fostering in-depth knowledge exchange, trust, and a shared understanding. However, a network with strong and weak ties can balance depth and diversity in collaborative endeavors (Corvello et al., 2023). The diversity of connections within a network enhances the richness of collaborative interactions. Diverse connections expose actors to various perspectives, ideas, and expertise, fostering creativity and innovation. A network with a broad spectrum of connections is more resilient and adaptable to changing circumstances (Ritala & Stefan, 2021). The centrality of actors in a network signifies their importance and influence. Central actors often act as bridges, connecting disparate parts of the network. Their strategic position enhances the efficiency of information flow and collaboration, contributing significantly to the overall effectiveness of the innovation ecosystem (Della Porta, 2020).

Innovation ecosystems are dynamic, and their networks evolve. New actors join, relationships form and dissolve, and knowledge flows shift. Understanding the evolution of networks is crucial for adapting collaborative strategies. Empirical studies tracking network evolution provide insights into the long-term impact of collaborations on innovation outcomes (Zahoor & Al-Tabbaa, 2020). Empirical studies are instrumental in uncovering the intricate dynamics of collaboration within specific innovation ecosystems. These studies provide real-world insights into the effectiveness of different collaboration forms, the roles played by diverse actors, and the impact of network structures on innovation outcomes. Such studies may focus on collaboration within industries like biotechnology, information technology, renewable energy, or healthcare, offering valuable lessons and benchmarks for optimizing collaborative efforts in diverse contexts (Köhler et al., 2022).

Navigating Industry-Specific Context and Institutional Frameworks in Innovation Ecosystems

In the intricate landscape of innovation ecosystems, understanding the industry-specific context and institutional frameworks is paramount to unleashing the full potential of collaborative endeavors. This discussion aims to unravel the industry-specific knowledge bases, technological trajectories, the influence of formal and informal institutions on knowledge exchange, the role of path dependence, and historical factors shaping innovation in distinct industries (Pagano et al., 2021). Case studies will illuminate the nuanced dynamics of knowledge exchange and collaboration within diverse industry contexts. Different industries possess unique knowledge bases shaped by their requirements, challenges, and opportunities. For example, industries like biotechnology may emphasize biological sciences, while information technology may focus on digital innovation (Abioye et al., 2021). Understanding these specialized knowledge bases is crucial for effective collaboration, ensuring that the right expertise is brought to the table. Technological trajectories delineate technologies' historical evolution and future potential within an industry. For instance, the trajectory in renewable energy may involve advancements in solar or wind technologies. Recognizing these trajectories allows collaborators to align their efforts with the industry's long-term goals and anticipate future developments

(Aaldering & Song, 2019). Intellectual property regimes significantly influence knowledge exchange and collaboration dynamics. Industries with strong intellectual property protection, like pharmaceuticals, may encourage formal collaborations to share risks and rewards. In contrast, industries with open-source traditions, such as software development, may collectively foster informal collaborations to advance innovation (Olk & West, 2020).

Regulatory frameworks shape the parameters within which industries operate. Industries like healthcare are highly regulated, requiring collaborations to navigate complex compliance issues. Understanding and adapting to regulatory constraints is essential for successful knowledge exchange and collaboration within such industries (Gao & McDonald, 2022). Industry norms set the standard practices and expectations within a particular sector. Collaborators must be attuned to these norms, whether manufacturing standards in the automotive industry or design conventions in the fashion industry. Conforming to and challenging these norms can be strategic considerations in collaborative efforts (Duffy et al., 2019).

Organizational and societal cultural values play a pivotal role in shaping collaboration dynamics. For example, industries valuing a culture of experimentation and risk-taking, like technology, may be more conducive to open innovation. Understanding and aligning with these cultural values enhances the effectiveness of collaborative initiatives (Chandler & Krajcsák, 2021). Path dependence refers to the idea that historical developments influence current and future trajectories. Historical choices, technologies, or market preferences create path dependencies in certain industries. For instance, the path dependence in the automotive industry towards combustion engines has profound implications for collaborative efforts aimed at transitioning to electric vehicles (Blažek et al., 2020). Historical factors, including past successes and failures, shape the innovation landscape within industries. Industries with a history of successful collaborations may be more open to similar endeavors, while those with past challenges may approach collaborations cautiously. Understanding these historical factors informs the strategic planning of collaborative initiatives (Bogers et al., 2019).

In biotechnology, collaborative efforts often involve partnerships between research institutions and pharmaceutical companies. Case studies reveal how knowledge exchange, particularly in genomics and drug development, accelerates innovation and contributes to groundbreaking medical advancements (O'Dwyer et al., 2023). The information technology sector thrives on collaborative platforms and open-source initiatives. Case studies highlight how companies collaborate on software development, contributing to shared repositories and leveraging collective intelligence to drive technological progress (Elia et al., 2020). Collaborations in the renewable energy industry span technological domains such as solar, wind, and energy storage. Case studies showcase how diverse actors, including startups, established companies, and research institutions, collaborate to overcome challenges and propel the industry toward sustainability (Barman et al., 2023). The healthcare industry, characterized by complex regulatory landscapes, relies on collaborations to advance medical research and develop innovative treatments. Case studies illustrate how cross-sector collaborations between academia, pharmaceuticals, and regulatory bodies navigate regulatory hurdles to bring new therapies to market

(Crosby & Bryson, 2005). In the automotive industry, collaborations are essential for adapting to the shift toward electric vehicles and autonomous technologies. Case studies reveal how traditional automotive manufacturers collaborate with technology companies and startups to integrate new technologies and redefine the future of transportation (Sierzchula et al., 2012).

Knowledge Flows and Collaboration in Innovation Ecosystems

Innovation ecosystems thrive on exchanging knowledge and collaborative efforts among diverse stakeholders. Knowledge flows within these ecosystems encompass the transfer of implicit and explicit knowledge facilitated by formal and informal channels (Fabiano et al., 2020). Tacit knowledge, rooted in individuals' experiences and expertise, often flows through personal interactions, mentorship, and hands-on experiences (Kikoski & Kikoski, 2004). In contrast, explicit knowledge, codified and documented, is shared through reports, manuals, and databases. This exchange of expertise fuels creativity, problem-solving, and the development of new ideas, driving innovation forward within the ecosystem (Botha et al., 2014). Collaboration is equally vital, as it enables stakeholders to leverage complementary expertise, resources, and perspectives to tackle complex challenges and seize emerging opportunities. Whether through formal partnerships, joint ventures, or informal interactions, collaboration fosters synergy, accelerates learning, and enhances the collective intelligence of the ecosystem (Reypens et al., 2016).

Various factors, including organizational culture, communication channels, and infrastructure, shape the dynamics of knowledge flows and collaboration within innovation ecosystems. Trust and social ties are foundational elements that facilitate knowledge absorption and cooperation. In a collaborative ecosystem, trust fosters open communication and the sharing of sensitive or proprietary information, while social ties create a network where individuals feel comfortable exchanging knowledge (Appio et al., 2019). Cultural factors within organizations and broader societal contexts significantly influence knowledge absorption and collaboration dynamics (Del Giudice et al., 2011). An organizational culture that values continuous learning, experimentation, and risk-taking is more conducive to knowledge exchange and collaborative endeavors. Effective communication channels, both formal and informal, play a pivotal role in facilitating the seamless exchange of knowledge within the ecosystem. At the same time, infrastructure, encompassing physical and technological aspects, supports efficient knowledge sharing through digital platforms and collaborative tools (Azeem et al., 2021).

Moreover, collaboration within innovation ecosystems extends beyond organizational boundaries, encompassing partnerships between academia, industry, government, and other entities. These collaborations often bridge diverse expertise and resources, driving interdisciplinary innovation and addressing complex societal challenges. The strength of ties within the ecosystem, whether strong or weak, influences the depth and intensity of collaboration, while the diversity of connections fosters creativity and resilience (Russell & Smorodinskaya, 2018). Innovation ecosystems are dynamic and continually evolving as new actors join, relationships form

and dissolve, and knowledge flows adapt to changing circumstances. Understanding and navigating these dynamics is essential for fostering thriving innovation ecosystems that drive transformative breakthroughs and contribute meaningfully to economic growth and societal development (Davis, 2016).

Research Gaps

The existing literature on innovation ecosystems and collaboration reveals several discernible gaps that form the foundation for this study. Notably, there is a limited focus on specific industries, with a significant gap in comprehensive studies that delve into the nuances of collaboration within distinct sectors (Rejeb et al., 2023; Remko, 2020). Additionally, certain forms of collaboration remain understudied, particularly those that transcend traditional boundaries and involve unconventional actors (Koch, 2018). Furthermore, a notable gap exists in the literature regarding the insufficient consideration of industry-specific factors that influence collaboration dynamics, hindering a holistic understanding of these complex ecosystems (Delgado et al., 2019; Lütjen et al., 2019). This study positions itself as a pioneering effort to bridge these identified gaps. By concentrating on specific industries, exploring diverse forms of collaboration, and meticulously considering industry-specific factors, it seeks to contribute novel insights to the existing body of knowledge. The research will address the dearth of comprehensive industry-specific analyses and offer a nuanced understanding of collaboration dynamics within these sectors (Kotiranta et al., 2020; Lager 2017). Moreover, the study adopts a fresh perspective by incorporating a novel theoretical framing that integrates various dimensions of knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics, filling a void in the current literature.

The uniqueness of this research lies in its methodology, industry-specific focus, and innovative theoretical framing. The method employs a cross-industry examination approach, drawing upon in-depth case studies from diverse sectors such as biotechnology, information technology, renewable energy, and healthcare, broadening the study's scope and allowing for a comprehensive analysis of collaboration dynamics in varied contexts. Additionally, the research adopts a theoretical framing that integrates established concepts, such as knowledge spillover theory and network theory, to create a cohesive and holistic understanding of collaboration within innovation ecosystems.

The interplay between knowledge flows, collaboration dynamics, and industry-specific contexts is a core focus of this study. By investigating how knowledge is exchanged and collaboration unfolds within specific industries, the research aims to uncover patterns, challenges, and success factors unique to each sector (Al-Tabbaa & Ankrah, 2016; Filieri et al., 2014). Understanding this interplay will shed light on the intricacies of innovation ecosystems, offering valuable insights for stakeholders seeking to enhance collaborative efforts within their respective industries. The study will conduct a detailed analysis of factors influencing collaboration outcomes, specifically focusing on absorptive capacity, network structures, and institutional frameworks. Absorptive capacity, reflecting the ability of entities to absorb external knowledge, will be examined to understand how effectively organizations within innovation ecosystems

leverage shared insights. Network structures, encompassing the strength of ties, diversity of connections, and centrality of actors, will be analyzed to discern their impact on the success of collaborative endeavors (Bodin, 2017).

Moreover, the institutional frameworks, including intellectual property regimes and industry norms, will be scrutinized for their role in shaping collaboration dynamics (Al-Tabbaa & Ankrah, 2016). Recognizing the dynamic and co-evolutionary nature of relationships within innovation ecosystems is a key aspect of this study. Innovation ecosystems are not static; they evolve as new actors join, relationships form and dissolve, and knowledge flows shift (Russell & Smorodinskaya, 2018). The research will delve into the temporal dimension of collaboration, examining how these relationships adapt and influence the overall innovation outcomes within dynamic and evolving ecosystems. Understanding the co-evolutionary nature of these relationships is essential for devising strategies that are effective in the current context and adaptable to the evolving landscape of innovation.

Research Methodology

The chosen research design for this study is a concurrent embedded design, strategically combining qualitative and quantitative research approaches. This design allows for the simultaneous collection of qualitative and quantitative data within each case study ecosystem, fostering a comprehensive and nuanced exploration of the complex dynamics within innovation ecosystems.

Research Design

A concurrent embedded design was employed in this study, involving the concurrent collection of both qualitative and quantitative data. This design proved advantageous for gaining a comprehensive understanding of knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics within innovation ecosystems, leveraging the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative data collection provided depth and context, offering rich insights into the intricacies of the aforementioned phenomena. Concurrently, quantitative data collection provided statistical validation and numerical support, enhancing the robustness and generalizability of the study's findings.

Qualitative Data Collection

Sampling

Purposeful sampling was employed to fully understand the ecosystem's diverse perspectives and experiences. Key informants representing various roles across academia, industry, government, and intermediary organizations were carefully selected. This strategic approach ensured in-depth insights from stakeholders directly involved in shaping the ecosystem's knowledge flow and collaboration dynamics, encompassing perspectives from both formal and informal networks.

Instruments

Semi-structured interview guides with open-ended questions were utilized to delve into the intricacies of knowledge exchange and collaboration. These carefully crafted inquiries were designed to evoke detailed narratives, uncover the unspoken motivations driving stakeholder actions, and explore the subtle nuances of collaboration within the innovation ecosystem. This approach aimed to move beyond superficial responses and capture the multifaceted realities of knowledge flows and collaborative interactions within this dynamic environment.

Analysis

To unravel the rich tapestry of insights woven within the qualitative data, thematic analysis was rigorously employed. This meticulous process involved iterative coding, allowing for the constant refinement and emergence of key themes as new information surfaced. Through this iterative dance, recurring patterns, underlying connections, and central insights resonated, culminating in a comprehensive understanding of the ecosystem's knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics.

Quantitative Data Collection

Beyond the in-depth narratives captured through interviews, concurrently administered surveys and structured questionnaires engaged a broader sample, yielding quantifiable data that could be subjected to rigorous statistical analysis. This quantitative approach served two key purposes: first, to statistically validate the emerging themes and patterns from the qualitative findings, bolstering their generalizability and credibility, and second, to generate numerical insights that offered a complementary perspective on the dynamics of knowledge flows and collaboration within the ecosystem.

Sampling

In the context of this study focused on the United Kingdom, a meticulous sampling strategy was employed to ensure a comprehensive representation of the innovation ecosystem within the country. Adopting a random sampling approach, the study aimed to engage 200 participants, each selected to reflect the diverse characteristics inherent in the UK's innovation landscape. The participants were carefully chosen from academia, industry, government, and intermediary organizations in the United Kingdom, encompassing a broad spectrum of roles, expertise levels, and backgrounds specific to the UK's innovation ecosystem. This deliberate selection facilitated a nuanced exploration of collaboration dynamics and knowledge flows within the United Kingdom's innovation landscape. The cross-sectional nature of the sampling further enriched the study, capturing a snapshot of the UK's innovation ecosystem's dynamics at a specific point in time. This approach allowed for a holistic understanding of how actors from different

sectors and career stages contribute to the intricate tapestry of innovation, providing valuable insights into the collaborative forces driving transformative breakthroughs within the UK's innovation ecosystem.

Instruments

The survey instrument included closed-ended questions, Likert scales, and multiple-choice formats. These questions were aligned with the qualitative themes identified during the research, enabling triangulation and validation of findings. The incorporation of diverse question types facilitated a comprehensive exploration of participants' perspectives within the innovation ecosystem. Closed-ended questions allowed for structured responses, while Likert scales provided a quantitative measure of participants' opinions. Multiple-choice formats offered a range of options, enhancing the granularity of responses and capturing a nuanced understanding of collaboration dynamics. This methodological choice ensured that the survey instrument was robust and capable of eliciting detailed quantitative insights, complementing the qualitative data obtained through in-depth interviews.

Analysis

A multifaceted approach will be applied in the analytical phase of this study focused on the United Kingdom's innovation ecosystem. The integration of descriptive statistics, inferential analysis, and correlation studies is designed to provide a comprehensive quantitative interpretation of the collected data. Descriptive statistics will serve as the initial lens, summarizing key features of the dataset, such as central tendencies, variations, and distribution patterns. This foundational step is essential for establishing a clear overview of the quantitative variables and their characteristics specific to the UK's innovation landscape.

The study will employ inferential analysis to move beyond the surface-level insights of descriptive statistics. This method allows for the extrapolation of findings from the sample to the broader population, offering insights into trends, patterns, and potential relationships within the United Kingdom's innovation ecosystem. The inferential analysis will contribute to a deeper understanding of collaboration dynamics and knowledge flows, enhancing the study's capacity to draw meaningful conclusions about the innovation landscape.

Additionally, correlation studies will be implemented to explore relationships between different variables within the dataset. This analytical tool will unveil the interconnected factors influencing collaboration and knowledge exchange. By examining the degree and direction of correlations, the study aims to identify patterns that may elucidate the dynamics shaping innovation within the United Kingdom.

Integration of Qualitative and Quantitative Findings

The concurrent embedded design employed in this study facilitates the seamless integration of qualitative and quantitative findings, enhancing the depth and richness of the overall analysis. Central to this integration is the application of triangulation,

a systematic approach involving comparing and contrasting results derived from both qualitative and quantitative methods. Triangulation serves as a methodological strategy to ensure the robustness and comprehensiveness of the understanding gained from exploring knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics within each case study ecosystem. Qualitative data gathered through in-depth interviews offer nuanced insights into the intricacies of collaboration. Concurrently, quantitative data collected through surveys and structured questionnaires provide numerical support and statistical significance to the identified patterns.

By triangulating the findings, the study aims to validate and corroborate the results obtained through different lenses, thus minimizing the potential biases associated with individual methodologies. The synthesis of qualitative and quantitative insights allows for a more holistic interpretation, providing a nuanced understanding of the interplay between various factors influencing innovation within the United Kingdom's innovation ecosystem. This integration not only strengthens the credibility of the study's outcomes but also fosters a more comprehensive comprehension of the complex dynamics governing knowledge flows and collaboration within the unique context of each case study. Ultimately, the triangulation process ensures that the study's conclusions are grounded in a well-rounded exploration of the innovation landscape in the United Kingdom.

Results

Facilitators and Impediments to Knowledge Flow

Table 1 critically analyzes facilitators and impediments to knowledge flow within innovation ecosystems, categorizing themes into trust and openness, effective communication, network structures and density, organizational incentives, and cultural factors. The facilitating factors include shared values and goals, regular interaction and knowledge exchange events, strong ties and dense networks, alignment of innovation goals with individual performance metrics, and collaborative and open organizational culture. These factors, exemplified by insightful excerpts such as collaborative success based on a common vision for sustainable agriculture, highlight the importance of interpersonal relationships, communication, network strength, aligned incentives, and organizational culture in fostering knowledge exchange. On the flip side, impediments encompass a lack of trust or transparency, poor communication channels, fragmented networks or weak connections, siloed structures, and risk-averse cultures. The provided excerpts, such as the acknowledgment of a vital monthly innovation forum for collaboration and the encouragement to collaborate for innovation pipeline contribution, emphasize the tangible impact of these impediments.

Table 2 critically analyzes the correlations between network density and information sharing within innovation ecosystems. The correlation coefficient of 0.37 indicates a moderate positive correlation, and the associated p-value of 0.003 suggests statistical significance. The interpretation reveals that as network density increases, there is a corresponding increase in the frequency of information exchange within the ecosystem. However, the qualifier 'but not proportionally' implies that while a

Table 1 Facilitators and impediments to knowledge flow within innovation ecosystems

Theme	Facilitating factors	Impeding factors	Excerpts
Trust and openness	-Shared values and goals among ecosystem actors	-Lack of trust or transparency between organizations	'*We collaborate well with researchers because we share a common vision for sustainable agriculture.*' (Entrepreneur)
Effective communication	-Regular interaction and knowledge exchange events	-Poor communication channels or infrequent communication	'*The monthly innovation forum is vital for us to stay updated on each other's work and identify potential collaborations.*' (Government official)
Network structures and density	-Strong ties and dense networks between actors	-Fragmented networks or weak connections between sectors	'*Being part of this cluster gives us access to a diverse range of expertise and resources.*' (Startup founder)
Organizational incentives	-Alignment of innovation goals with individual performance metrics	-Siloed structures or disincentives for knowledge sharing	'*My company encourages me to collaborate with external partners, as it contributes to our innovation pipeline.*' (Researcher)
Cultural factors	-Collaborative and open culture within organizations	-Individualistic or risk-averse cultures	'*We have a culture of learning and experimentation, which makes us open to sharing and trying new ideas.*' (University professor)

Table 2 Correlations between network density and information sharing

Variable	Correlation coefficient	*p*-value	Interpretation
Network density	0.37	0.003	A moderate positive correlation exists between network density and information sharing. As network density increases, the frequency of information exchange within the ecosystem also increases, but not proportionally

rise in network density positively influences information sharing, it may not do so in a linear or direct manner. This nuanced insight suggests that other factors could contribute to the complexity of information exchange dynamics, emphasizing that a denser network alone may not guarantee a proportional increase in information sharing. The findings underscore the need for a more intricate understanding of the interplay between network structures and information flow, providing valuable guidance for ecosystem stakeholders aiming to optimize collaboration and knowledge dissemination.

Table 3 provides a nuanced analysis of factors influencing knowledge flow within innovation ecosystems, employing mean scores and statistical significance measures. Trust in other ecosystem actors emerges as a robust facilitator, as evidenced by the high mean score of 4.1 and a low standard deviation of 0.7, indicating consensus among respondents. The extremely low p-value ($p < 0.001$) reinforces the statistical significance, emphasizing the pivotal role of trust in fostering effective knowledge exchange, which aligns with existing literature highlighting the centrality of trust in collaborative environments. Moving to the frequency of knowledge sharing events, the moderate mean score of 3.3 and a higher standard deviation of 1.1 suggest a more varied perception among respondents. While the statistical significance ($p < 0.01$) underscores the overall importance of such events, the wider range of opinions implies that organizations may differ in assessing the impact of knowledge-sharing occasions. This diversity of perspectives could be attributed to variations in organizational culture and priorities.

The network density score, with a high mean of 3.9 and a low standard deviation of 0.6, signifies a shared recognition among respondents regarding the positive influence of network density on knowledge flow. The low p-value ($p < 0.005$) further substantiates the statistical significance, emphasizing that a dense network structure contributes significantly to the frequency of information exchange. This finding is consistent with network theory, highlighting the importance of robust connections in fostering collaboration. In contrast, organizational incentives for knowledge sharing present a lower mean score of 2.9 and a higher standard deviation of 1.2, indicating a more diverse range of opinions on the effectiveness of such incentives. The p-value exceeding 0.05 suggests that, on average, respondents did not perceive organizational incentives as statistically significant facilitators of knowledge flow. This variation in opinions underscores the complexity of incentivizing knowledge sharing within diverse organizational settings.

Table 3 Mean scores and statistical significance of factors influencing knowledge flow

Factor	Mean score	Standard deviation	Statistical significance
Trust in other ecosystem actors	4.1	0.7	$p < 0.001$
Frequency of knowledge-sharing events	3.3	1.1	$p < 0.01$
Network density score	3.9	0.6	$p < 0.005$
Organizational incentives for knowledge sharing	2.9	1.2	$p > 0.05$

Combining qualitative and quantitative data revealed complementary and contrasting insights into knowledge flow facilitators and impediments. Trust, openness, and network density emerged as key themes across methods, highlighting the importance of fostering trustful relationships and robust connections within ecosystems. While both approaches recognized the potential of knowledge-sharing events and organizational incentives, the quantitative data lacked the nuance of qualitative explorations, suggesting further research in these areas. This triangulation strengthens the study's conclusions, offering valuable guidance for cultivating thriving innovation ecosystems where knowledge flows freely.

Forms and Impact of Collaboration

Table 4 systematically outlines various forms of collaboration in innovation ecosystems, providing insights into the factors influencing their formation and success. The classification of collaboration into formal partnerships, informal networks, joint research projects, and mentorship programs allows for a comprehensive examination of diverse collaborative structures. Formal partnerships, exemplified by university-industry R&D collaborations and joint ventures, are shaped by shared intellectual property, funding opportunities, and complementary expertise. The factors influencing their success, including effective communication, trust, alignment of goals, and project management, underscore the importance of clear structures and mutual understanding, which aligns with established literature emphasizing the significance of well-defined roles and transparent communication in formal collaborations.

Informal networks, represented by knowledge exchange forums and peer-to-peer mentoring programs, thrive on shared interests, personal connections, and a willingness to help. The success of informal networks hinges on regular interaction, trust, open communication, and value-added exchange. The emphasis on personal connections and open communication resonates with the social aspects of collaboration, recognizing the role of relationships in fostering informal knowledge exchange.

Joint research projects involving multi-sector consortia and cross-institutional research teams are formed around access to funding, diverse expertise, and addressing complex challenges. Success in joint research projects is contingent upon clear leadership, effective communication, collaborative decision-making, and shared goals. The emphasis on collaborative decision-making and shared goals aligns with the intricate coordination required in large-scale projects involving multiple stakeholders.

Mentorship programs featuring senior experts guiding junior individuals and cross-sector knowledge transfer rely on willingness to mentor/be mentored, shared interests, and perceived value. Successful mentorship programs necessitate regular meetings, open communication, trust, and concrete tasks and feedback, emphasizing the importance of mentor–mentee relationships and structured communication in facilitating knowledge transfer and skill development.

Table 5 provides a quantitative overview of the prevalence and impact of different collaboration types within innovation ecosystems, offering valuable insights into their contributions to innovation outcomes. The categorization into formal

Table 4 Factor shaping collaboration structures in innovation ecosystems

Form of collaboration	Examples	Factors influencing formation	Factors influencing success
Formal partnerships	University-industry R&D collaborations, joint ventures	Shared intellectual property, funding opportunities, complementary expertise	Effective communication, trust, alignment of goals, project management
Informal networks	Knowledge exchange forums, peer-to-peer mentoring programs	Shared interests, personal connections, willingness to help	Regular interaction, trust, open communication, value-added exchange
Joint research projects	Multi-sector consortia for large-scale projects, cross-institutional research teams	Access to funding, diverse expertise, addressing complex challenges	Clear leadership, effective communication, collaborative decision-making, shared goals
Mentorship programs	Senior experts guiding junior individuals, cross-sector knowledge transfer	Willingness to mentor/be mentored, shared interests, perceived value	Regular meetings, open communication, trust, concrete tasks and feedback

Table 5 Prevalence and impact of collaboration types in innovation ecosystems

Collaboration type	Prevalence (%)	Impact on innovation outcomes (%)	Additional points
Formal partnerships	45	+ 20 (new products)	Increased funding, access to expertise
Informal networks	60	+ 15 (services)	Knowledge sharing, rapid prototyping
Joint research projects	20	+ 30 (technologies)	Breakthrough solutions, addressing complex challenges
Mentorship programs	35	+ 10 (skills development)	Increased innovation capacity, talent retention

partnerships, informal networks, joint research projects, and mentorship programs, along with associated prevalence and impact percentages, allows for a structured comparison. Formal Partnerships, with a prevalence of 45%, are reported to have a substantial impact of + 20% on new product development. The additional points highlight the benefits of increased funding and access to expertise, which aligns with existing literature emphasizing the role of formal collaborations in driving innovation through resource sharing and specialized knowledge.

Informal networks, reported at a higher prevalence of 60%, contribute to innovation outcomes with a + 15% impact on services. The additional points underscore the significance of knowledge sharing and rapid prototyping in informal settings, which resonates with the understanding that informal interactions foster creativity and idea exchange, leading to agile development processes.

Joint research projects, reported at a prevalence of 20%, exhibit the highest impact of + 30% on technologies. The associated benefits include developing breakthrough solutions and collaboratively addressing complex challenges, highlighting the transformative potential of large-scale, cross-sector research initiatives in driving technological advancements. With a prevalence of 35%, mentorship programs contribute to innovation outcomes with a + 10% impact on skills development. The additional points emphasize the role of mentorship in increasing innovation capacity and retaining talent, which aligns with the recognition of mentorship as a valuable mechanism for transferring knowledge, fostering professional growth, and retaining skilled individuals.

Table 6 presents a comprehensive analysis of factors influencing the success of collaborations within innovation ecosystems, utilizing mean scores, statistical significance (p-value), and interpretations. The factors evaluated include shared goals and vision, effective communication and transparency, trust and mutual respect, project management and clear roles, and access to resources and funding.

Shared goals and vision received a high mean score of 4.2, indicating a strong positive correlation with collaboration success, supported by a highly significant p-value of < 0.001, which emphasizes the critical role of alignment in goals and vision for successful collaborations. The finding aligns with established literature highlighting the importance of a shared strategic direction for fostering effective partnerships.

Effective communication and transparency also received a high mean score of 4.1, indicating a positive correlation with collaboration success. The statistically significant p-value of < 0.01 supports the importance of communication in successful collaborations, emphasizing that higher scores in this factor correspond to greater collaboration success. This result aligns with existing research emphasizing the pivotal role of clear and transparent communication in mitigating misunderstandings and ensuring shared understanding among collaborators.

Trust and mutual respect emerged as a crucial factor, receiving the highest mean score of 4.3 and a highly significant p-value of < 0.001, underscoring the indispensability of trust and mutual respect for successful collaboration within innovation ecosystems. The finding aligns with literature recognizing trust as a cornerstone for effective collaboration, fostering open communication and a conducive environment for knowledge exchange.

Table 6 Factors influencing collaboration success

Factor	Mean score (1–5)	Statistical significance (p-value)	Interpretation
Shared goals and vision	4.2	$p < 0.001$	Strong positive correlation with success
Effective communication and transparency	4.1	$p < 0.01$	Positive correlation; higher scores = greater success
Trust and mutual respect	4.3	$p < 0.001$	Highly significant; crucial for successful collaboration
Project management and clear roles	3.9	$p < 0.05$	Moderately important; structured management is needed
Access to resources and funding	3.8	$p < 0.05$	Moderately important; can facilitate but not guarantee success

Project Management and Clear Roles, with a mean score of 3.9 and a moderately important p-value of < 0.05, highlight the importance of structured management in collaboration success. While not as highly rated as trust or shared vision, the statistical significance indicates that effective project management and defined roles contribute significantly to collaboration success, which aligns with the understanding that clear structures and roles prevent confusion and enhance efficiency in collaborative efforts.

Access to Resources and Funding, with a mean score of 3.8 and a moderately important p-value of < 0.05, indicates that while important, these factors alone cannot guarantee collaboration success. The interpretation emphasizes their facilitating role, aligning with existing literature and acknowledging the supportive role of resources and funding in collaborative endeavors.

Qualitative and quantitative data converged on the prevalence and importance of diverse collaboration forms like formal partnerships, informal networks, and joint research, contributing to increased innovation through new products, services, and technologies. However, qualitative insights revealed nuanced influences not captured quantitatively, like trust's crucial role in success and cultural factors shaping network dynamics within ecosystems. This triangulation strengthens our understanding, highlighting the need for robust structures and fostering trust and open communication to cultivate thriving innovation landscapes.

Industry-Specific Influences

Table 7 provides a detailed analysis of industry-specific influences on knowledge exchange and collaboration dynamics within three distinct industries: biotech, sustainability, and robotics. In the biotech industry, high R&D costs and complex regulations create an environment where strategic partnerships and joint ventures are emphasized, reflecting the need to share the burdens of costly research endeavors. Strong patent protection, while fostering innovation, contributes to limited informal knowledge sharing due to concerns about intellectual property. The CEO's excerpt highlights the delicate balance between collaboration and competition, where early-stage research collaboration with universities coexists with the need to safeguard core discoveries due to competitive pressures. This industry-specific analysis underscores Biotech's unique challenges and opportunities, emphasizing the strategic nature of collaborations and the impact of IP considerations on knowledge-sharing dynamics.

Sustainability, characterized by a fragmented market and diverse stakeholders, experiences a growing public demand for transparency. Frequent knowledge-sharing events and a focus on open innovation are prominent in this industry, reflecting the need for cross-sector collaborations to address systemic challenges. The NGO representative's statement highlights the essential role of collaboration across sectors and disciplines to meet sustainability goals. This analysis emphasizes the pivotal role of transparency and open innovation platforms in fostering collaboration within the sustainability sector, aligning with the industry's interdisciplinary nature. In the robotics industry, rapid technological advancements

Table 7 Industry-specific influences on knowledge exchange and collaboration

Industry	Industry-specific factors	Influence on knowledge exchange	Influence on collaboration dynamics
Biotech	-High R&D costs, complex regulations -Strong patent protection	-Emphasis on strategic partnerships and joint ventures -Limited informal knowledge sharing due to IP concerns	*'We collaborate with universities for early-stage research but keep core discoveries close due to competitive pressure.'* (Biotech CEO)
Sustainability	-Fragmented market, diverse stakeholders -Growing public pressure for transparency	- Frequent knowledge-sharing events, focus on open innovation -Cross-sector collaborations for systemic change	*'Sustainability requires collaboration across industries and disciplines. We actively participate in open innovation platforms.'* (NGO representative)
Robotics	-Rapid technological advancements, dynamic market -Need for talent with cutting-edge skills	-Strong emphasis on talent attraction and retention -Active online communities for knowledge sharing and collaboration	*'Recruiting engineers with the latest skills is crucial. We collaborate with universities to develop relevant training programs.'* (Robotics startup founder)

and a dynamic market necessitate a strong emphasis on talent attraction and retention. Active online communities serve as platforms for knowledge sharing and collaboration, reflecting the industry's reliance on cutting-edge skills. The excerpt from the robotics startup founder underscores the importance of collaborating with universities to develop relevant training programs, emphasizing the industry's commitment to staying at the forefront of technological advancements. This analysis highlights the dynamic nature of collaboration within the robotics sector, which is driven by the need for continuous skills development and adaptation to technological shifts.

Table 8 presents a comparative analysis of industry-specific influences on knowledge flow and collaboration within the biotech, sustainability, and robotics sectors. In the biotech industry, the network density score is moderate (3.6), indicating a reasonable level of interconnectedness among industry actors. However, the information-sharing frequency is average (3.2), suggesting that while there is moderate collaboration, the exchange of information may not be as frequent. The high prevalence of formal partnerships and low participation in informal networks aligns with the industry's emphasis on protecting intellectual property (IP), as indicated by the research scientist's insight. Strict IP regulations limit informal knowledge sharing, emphasizing the importance of structured and formal collaborations in this industry.

Sustainability demonstrates a dense network (3.8) and high information-sharing frequency (3.5), indicating robust knowledge flow within the sector. The moderate prevalence of formal partnerships and high participation in informal networks align with the industry's collaborative nature, as highlighted by the NGO director. Frequent cross-sector events and online platforms play a crucial role in facilitating open innovation, emphasizing the sector's commitment to interdisciplinary collaboration. The robotics industry exhibits a high network density score (3.9) and an above-average information-sharing frequency (3.4), reflecting a highly interconnected and collaborative environment. The moderate prevalence of formal partnerships and high participation in informal networks suggest a balanced approach to collaboration. The startup founder's insight emphasizes the significance of online communities in knowledge exchange and talent acquisition, underscoring the industry's reliance on dynamic and digitally driven collaboration.

Qualitative and quantitative data shed light on the nuanced influence of industry-specific factors on knowledge flow and collaboration. Both methods highlighted the impact of regulatory environments, like strict IP in biotech, and market characteristics, like fragmented stakeholders in sustainability, on knowledge exchange patterns. However, qualitative insights revealed further depths, emphasizing the role of cultural factors like openness in sustainability and technology advancements driving online communities in robotics, which were not fully captured quantitatively. This triangulation emphasizes the multifaceted nature of industry-specific influences, highlighting the need for statistical analysis and qualitative exploration to understand knowledge and collaboration dynamics within diverse ecosystems.

Table 8 Industry-specific influences on knowledge flow and collaboration

Industry	Network density score	Information sharing frequency	Formal partnership prevalence	Informal network participation	Interview insights
Biotech	3.6 (moderate)	3.2 (average)	High	Low	*'Strict IP regulations limit informal knowledge sharing in our industry.'* (Research Scientist)
Sustainability	3.8 (dense)	3.5 (high)	Moderate	High	*'Frequent cross-sector events and online platforms facilitate open innovation.'* (NGO Director)
Robotics	3.9 (high)	3.4 (above average)	Moderate	High	*'Online communities play a crucial role in knowledge exchange and talent acquisition.'* (Startup Founder)

Discussion

The findings of this study provide valuable insights into the intricate dynamics of knowledge flows and collaboration within innovation ecosystems, with a particular focus on the United Kingdom. In terms of knowledge flow facilitators, the results align with existing literature, emphasizing the crucial role of trust, effective communication, network structures, organizational incentives, and cultural factors. These themes resonate with established theoretical frameworks such as knowledge spillover theory, absorptive capacity, and network evolution (Ferreira et al., 2023; Proeger, 2020; Zeng et al., 2019). The study's contribution lies in the nuanced exploration of these concepts within the specific context of the UK's innovation ecosystem, substantiating and enriching existing knowledge.

One notable result is the significance of trust and network density, as revealed by both qualitative and quantitative data, which aligns with prior research highlighting the importance of trust in fostering collaboration and the positive correlation between network density and information sharing (Chow & Chan, 2008; Hsu et al., 2007; Nowell, 2009). The triangulation of findings enhances the robustness of these conclusions, underlining the need for a multifaceted approach to understanding the dynamics governing innovation landscapes. Exploring collaboration structures and their impact on innovation outcomes unveils a rich tapestry of formal and informal partnerships, joint research projects, and mentorship programs. The prevalence and effects of these collaboration types, as quantified through both qualitative and quantitative lenses, contribute to the existing knowledge base. However, qualitative insights add depth by revealing nuanced influences on collaboration success, particularly the role of trust and cultural factors, which aligns with literature emphasizing the importance of shared goals, effective communication, and mutual respect in collaborative endeavors (Giffords & Calderon, 2015; Heath & Frey, 2004). The study's triangulation underscores the importance of structured collaboration forms while emphasizing the need to foster trust for thriving innovation landscapes.

The investigation into industry-specific influences on knowledge exchange and collaboration dynamics offers a unique contribution by shedding light on the distinct characteristics of the biotech, sustainability, and robotics sectors (Durugbo, 2016). The study aligns with existing literature recognizing the impact of regulatory environments and market characteristics (Belz & Binder, 2017). However, qualitative insights bring forth additional layers, emphasizing the role of cultural factors and technology advancements not fully captured quantitatively. This triangulation highlights the multifaceted nature of industry-specific influences, emphasizing the importance of statistical analysis and qualitative exploration for a comprehensive understanding (Dharmayanti et al., 2023).

In terms of unexpected or profound findings, the study uncovered the nuanced influence of cultural factors on collaboration dynamics, particularly within the sustainability and robotics industries. While existing literature acknowledges the impact of cultural factors, the depth of their influence, as revealed through qualitative insights, adds a new dimension to our understanding. This unexpected finding underscores the need for organizations and policymakers to consider cultural

factors actively in fostering collaboration within innovation ecosystems (Radziwon & Bogers, 2019). Comparing these results with prior studies reveals both consistencies and unique contributions. The emphasis on trust, effective communication, and network density aligns with established literature on collaboration dynamics (Cross et al., 2008). However, the study's specific focus on the UK's innovation ecosystem provides context-specific insights, contributing to the growing body of literature on innovation ecosystems (Arthur et al., 2023).

Additionally, the triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data strengthens the validity and reliability of the findings, addressing a common limitation in prior research that often relies on a single method (Gibson, 2017; Turner et al., 2017). In terms of general applicability, the study's identification of key facilitators and impediments, emphasis on structured collaboration forms coupled with trust-building, and insights into industry-specific influences offer actionable recommendations for stakeholders aiming to strategically develop and optimize future innovation ecosystems. The lessons learned from the UK's innovation landscape can be applied more broadly, serving as a valuable reference for global policymakers, industry leaders, and academics (Arthur et al., 2023).

Based on the empirically grounded insights gleaned from the comprehensive examination of knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics within the United Kingdom's innovation ecosystem, several recommendations emerge for nurturing more effective and impactful innovation ecosystems (Chandler et al., 2019). First and foremost, stakeholders should prioritize cultivating trust among ecosystem actors, recognizing its pivotal role in fostering collaboration (Goldman, 2012). Establishing and maintaining effective communication channels, both formal and informal, is essential for facilitating knowledge exchange (Pak & Lee, 2023). Additionally, emphasis should be placed on strengthening network structures and promoting density among ecosystem actors to enhance the frequency and depth of information sharing (Weiss et al., 2012). Organizations and policymakers are encouraged to align organizational incentives with innovation goals to further incentivize knowledge sharing (Guerrero et al., 2019). Acknowledging the nuanced influence of cultural factors and fostering a collaborative and open culture within organizations can significantly contribute to the success of collaborative endeavors (Srisathan et al., 2023). Furthermore, the study underscores the importance of structured collaboration forms, such as formal partnerships and mentorship programs, while highlighting the need for flexibility and adaptability in response to the dynamic evolution of innovation ecosystems over time (Breslin et al., 2021). These recommendations, grounded in empirical evidence, offer a strategic roadmap for cultivating thriving innovation ecosystems that can drive transformative breakthroughs and contribute meaningfully to economic growth and societal development.

While this study provides valuable insights into knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics within the United Kingdom's innovation ecosystem, it is essential to acknowledge certain limitations. The limitations of the study primarily revolve around its focus on a specific geographical context, namely, the United Kingdom, which could potentially restrict the generalizability of the findings to innovation ecosystems in other regions (Cavallo et al., 2021). While the study provides valuable insights into knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics within the UK's

innovation landscape, extrapolating these findings to diverse contexts might not be directly applicable due to cultural, regulatory, and economic variations across different regions (Ye & Crispeels, 2022). Moreover, the reliance on cross-sectional data offers only a snapshot of the ecosystem at a particular moment, potentially overlooking temporal changes and evolution within the innovation landscape. Additionally, the study's dependence on self-reported data, both qualitative and quantitative, introduces the possibility of response bias and subjectivity, impacting the reliability of the results. Furthermore, the complexity of innovation ecosystems entails numerous influencing factors beyond those explored in the study. While efforts were made to capture this complexity, unexplored variables may significantly influence knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics, necessitating further research to delve deeper into these intricacies. Addressing these limitations and exploring diverse geographical contexts, longitudinal data collection methods, and more objective measures could enhance the generalizability and robustness of future studies in this field, providing a more comprehensive understanding of innovation ecosystems and their dynamics on a global scale.

Conclusion

The comprehensive analysis of knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics within the innovation ecosystem of the United Kingdom has yielded rich insights that align closely with the study's objectives. Examining facilitators and impediments to knowledge flow revealed pivotal themes such as trust, effective communication, network structures, organizational incentives, and cultural factors. Both qualitative and quantitative data converged on the significance of trust and network density, indicating their critical role in fostering an environment conducive to knowledge exchange. The triangulation of findings enhances the study's credibility, providing nuanced recommendations for enhancing knowledge flow efficiency within innovation ecosystems.

The exploration of collaboration structures uncovered a myriad of formal and informal partnerships, joint research projects, and mentorship programs. The prevalence and impact of collaboration types were discerned through qualitative and quantitative lenses, emphasizing their contribution to innovation outcomes. However, qualitative insights added depth by revealing the nuanced influences of trust and cultural factors on collaboration success, insights not fully captured quantitatively. The study's robust triangulation underscores the need for structured collaboration forms and fostering trust for thriving innovation landscapes.

The investigation into industry-specific influences on knowledge exchange and collaboration dynamics provided a nuanced understanding of the unique characteristics of the biotech, sustainability, and robotics sectors. Both methods highlighted the impact of regulatory environments and market characteristics, but qualitative insights emphasized the role of cultural factors and technology advancements not fully captured quantitatively. This triangulation highlights the multifaceted nature of industry-specific influences, underlining the importance of statistical analysis and qualitative exploration for a comprehensive understanding. The study successfully identified key facilitators and impediments, emphasizing the pivotal role of trust,

effective communication, and network density in facilitating knowledge flow. The exploration of diverse collaboration forms, from formal partnerships to informal networks, provided a comprehensive understanding of their prevalence and impact on innovation outcomes.

Theoretical Implications

The theoretical foundations of our study represent a significant contribution to the discourse on innovation ecosystems. By delving into the intricate tapestry of knowledge exchange and collaboration dynamics, our research seeks to extend existing theories and frameworks, providing a more nuanced understanding of the forces that drive transformative breakthroughs within these vibrant networks. The study is grounded in well-established concepts, aiming to unravel the complexities within innovation ecosystems and distill actionable recommendations for their effective and impactful development.

One primary theoretical implication of our research lies in the evolution of knowledge spillover theory. While this theory, pioneered by economists such as Arrow (1962) and Romer (1990), initially focused on the spatial or economic proximity for knowledge transfer, our study expands its scope. Introducing the concept of absorptive capacity, influenced by the work of Cohen and Levinthal, we emphasize the internal factors shaping how different entities within innovation ecosystems assimilate and utilize external knowledge. This expansion enhances the theoretical framework, providing a more comprehensive understanding of knowledge exchange mechanisms.

Furthermore, our study contributes to the theoretical discourse on collaboration within innovation ecosystems by drawing upon network theory. Granovetter's (1973) concept of weak ties takes center stage, highlighting the importance of connections beyond close-knit groups in fostering diverse knowledge and perspectives. The incorporation of the concept of network evolution (Nooteboom et al., 2007) recognizes the dynamic nature of these ecosystems. Innovation ecosystems are not static entities; they continually adapt and evolve with new actors joining, relationships forming and dissolving, and knowledge flows shifting. This theoretical lens adds depth to our understanding of collaboration dynamics, emphasizing the ever-changing nature of these networks.

Additionally, our research integrates insights from institutional theory to explore industry-specific factors shaping knowledge exchange and collaboration dynamics. This theoretical lens recognizes the influence of formal and informal institutions, such as regulatory frameworks, intellectual property regimes, and industry norms, on how knowledge is shared within these ecosystems. The acknowledgment of path dependence further contributes to our understanding by highlighting how historical developments and established practices create dependencies that shape innovation trajectories within specific industries.

Managerial Implications

The findings of our study hold significant managerial implications for stakeholders within the innovation ecosystem of the United Kingdom. One prominent recommendation is the imperative to prioritize the cultivation of trust and effective communication channels. Building a culture of trust and openness among ecosystem actors, including universities, businesses, government agencies, and intermediaries, is crucial. Managers should actively foster shared values and goals to create an environment where knowledge can flow seamlessly. Regular communication channels, such as knowledge exchange events and forums, become a managerial priority to enhance collaboration and facilitate efficient knowledge transfer.

The study underscores the need for a strategic approach to collaboration within innovation ecosystems. Managers are encouraged to explore diverse collaboration structures, from formal partnerships to informal networks, to harness the full spectrum of collaborative opportunities. The prevalence and impact of collaboration types, as revealed through qualitative and quantitative lenses, emphasize the contribution of various collaboration forms to innovation outcomes. Creating an environment that fosters trust, transparency, and shared goals becomes paramount to the success of these collaborations.

Furthermore, our research highlights the industry-specific influences on knowledge exchange and collaboration dynamics. Managers need to recognize and adapt to the unique characteristics of their respective industries. In particular, attention should be given to the regulatory environments, market structures, and cultural factors shaping collaboration patterns. By aligning strategies with industry-specific considerations, managers can navigate challenges more effectively and leverage opportunities for innovation within their specific contexts.

In pursuing innovation, stakeholders should also consider the dynamic nature of innovation ecosystems. The recognition of network evolution emphasizes the importance of adaptability. Managers should proactively understand how innovation ecosystems evolve as new actors join, relationships form and dissolve, and knowledge flows shift. This understanding can inform strategic decision-making, ensuring that organizations remain agile and responsive to the changing dynamics of their ecosystems.

Ideas for Future Studies

Future studies in knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics within innovation ecosystems can explore several promising avenues to deepen our understanding and address current gaps. One avenue for future research involves adopting a longitudinal analysis to trace the evolution of innovation ecosystems over time. By examining how these ecosystems adapt and transform in response to evolving economic, social, and technological landscapes, researchers can provide valuable insights into the long-term dynamics that shape the success and sustainability of innovation ecosystems.

Comparative studies across global innovation ecosystems present another compelling area for future exploration. Analyzing innovation ecosystems in different countries and regions allows for identifying commonalities, differences, and unique factors influencing their success. Such comparative research can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the diverse strategies, cultural influences, and policy frameworks that contribute to adequate knowledge flows and collaboration.

Additionally, future studies could focus on conducting in-depth examinations of collaboration mechanisms within innovation ecosystems, which involves a nuanced exploration of formal partnerships, joint ventures, alliances, informal collaborations, and open innovation platforms. Understanding the intricacies of these collaboration forms, their prevalence, and their impact on innovation outcomes can provide valuable insights for stakeholders seeking to optimize collaboration strategies within their ecosystems.

Exploring the role of emerging technologies in shaping knowledge flows and collaboration dynamics represents another avenue for future research. With the rapid advancement of technologies such as artificial intelligence, blockchain, and the Internet of Things, understanding how these innovations influence collaboration patterns and information exchange within innovation ecosystems is crucial.

Moreover, investigating the role of diverse actors, such as small and medium enterprises (SMEs), grassroot organizations, and community-driven initiatives, can offer a more inclusive understanding of innovation ecosystems. Future studies could explore how these diverse entities contribute to knowledge creation, dissemination, and collaborative endeavors within the broader ecosystem.

Funding The authors acknowledge financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant numbers 42301299).

Data Availability The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Declarations

Conflict of Interest The authors declare no competing interests.

References

Aaldering, L. J., & Song, C. H. (2019). Tracing the technological development trajectory in post-lithium-ion battery technologies: A patent-based approach. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 241*, 118343.

Abbate, T., Codini, A. P., & Aquilani, B. (2019). Knowledge co-creation in open innovation digital platforms: Processes, tools and services. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 34*(7), 1434–1447.

Abioye, S. O., Oyedele, L. O., Akanbi, L., Ajayi, A., Delgado, J. M. D., Bilal, M., & Ahmed, A. (2021). Artificial intelligence in the construction industry: A review of present status, opportunities and future challenges. *Journal of Building Engineering, 44*, 103299.

Aliasghar, O., Sadeghi, A., & Rose, E. L. (2023). Process innovation in small-and medium-sized enterprises: The critical roles of external knowledge sourcing and absorptive capacity. *Journal of Small Business Management, 61*(4), 1583–1610.

Al-Tabbaa, O., & Ankrah, S. (2016). Social capital to facilitate 'engineered' university–industry collaboration for technology transfer: A dynamic perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 104*, 1–15.

Appio, F. P., Lima, M., & Paroutis, S. (2019). Understanding smart cities: Innovation ecosystems, technological advancements, and societal challenges. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 142*, 1–14.

Arrow, K. J. (1962). The economic implications of learning by doing. *The Review of Economic Studies, 29*(3), 155–173.

Arthur, D., Moizer, J., & Lean, J. (2023). A systems approach to mapping UK regional innovation ecosystems for policy insight. *Industry and Higher Education, 37*(2), 193–207.

Audretsch, D. B., & Lehmann, E. E. (2022). 39. The knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship. *Elgar Encyclopedia on the Economics of Knowledge and Innovation, 317*.

Azeem, M., Ahmed, M., Haider, S., & Sajjad, M. (2021). Expanding competitive advantage through organizational culture, knowledge sharing and organizational innovation. *Technology in Society, 66*, 101635.

Bacon, E., Williams, M. D., & Davies, G. (2020). Coopetition in innovation ecosystems: A comparative analysis of knowledge transfer configurations. *Journal of Business Research, 115*, 307–316.

Bakshi, V., & Biswas, A. (2023). Global narratives of knowledge and innovation-based development. *Urban commons, future smart cities and sustainability* (pp. 3–28). Springer International Publishing.

Barman, P., Dutta, L., Bordoloi, S., Kalita, A., Buragohain, P., Bharali, S., & Azzopardi, B. (2023). Renewable energy integration with electric vehicle technology: A review of the existing smart charging approaches. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 183*, 113518.

Bauer, Z., AbouAssi, K., & Johnston, J. (2022). Cross-sector collaboration formality: The effects of institutions and organizational leaders. *Public Management Review, 24*(2), 159–181.

Belz, F. M., & Binder, J. K. (2017). Sustainable entrepreneurship: A convergent process model. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 26*(1), 1–17.

Blažek, J., Květoň, V., Baumgartinger-Seiringer, S., & Trippl, M. (2020). The dark side of regional industrial path development: Towards a typology of trajectories of decline. *European Planning Studies, 28*(8), 1455–1473.

Bodin, Ö. (2017). Collaborative environmental governance: Achieving collective action in social-ecological systems. *Science, 357*(6352), eaan1114.

Bogers, M., Chesbrough, H., Heaton, S., & Teece, D. J. (2019). Strategic management of open innovation: A dynamic capabilities perspective. *California Management Review, 62*(1), 77–94.

Botha, A., Kourie, D., & Snyman, R. (2014). *Coping with continuous change in the business environment: Knowledge management and knowledge management technology*. Elsevier.

Breslin, D., Kask, J., Schlaile, M., & Abatecola, G. (2021). Developing a coevolutionary account of innovation ecosystems. *Industrial Marketing Management, 98*, 59–68.

Brydon-Miller, M., & Maguire, P. (2009). Participatory action research: Contributions to the development of practitioner inquiry in education. *Educational Action Research, 17*(1), 79–93.

Camisón, C., & Forés, B. (2010). Knowledge absorptive capacity: New insights for its conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Business Research, 63*(7), 707–715.

Carayannis, E. G., Grigoroudis, E., & Wurth, B. (2022). OR for entrepreneurial ecosystems: A problem-oriented review and agenda. *European Journal of Operational Research, 300*(3), 791–808.

Castañer, X., & Oliveira, N. (2020). Collaboration, coordination, and cooperation among organizations: Establishing the distinctive meanings of these terms through a systematic literature review. *Journal of Management, 46*(6), 965–1001.

Cavallo, A., Ghezzi, A., & Rossi-Lamastra, C. (2021). Small-medium enterprises and innovative startups in entrepreneurial ecosystems: Exploring an under-remarked relation. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 17*, 1843–1866.

Chandler, J. D., Danatzis, I., Wernicke, C., Akaka, M. A., & Reynolds, D. (2019). How does innovation emerge in a service ecosystem? *Journal of Service Research, 22*(1), 75–89.

Chandler, N., & Krajcsák, Z. (2021). Intrapreneurial fit and misfit: Enterprising behavior, preferred organizational and open innovation culture. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 7*(1), 61.

Chow, W. S., & Chan, L. S. (2008). Social network, social trust and shared goals in organizational knowledge sharing. *Information & Management, 45*(7), 458–465.

Corvello, V., Felicetti, A. M., Steiber, A., & Alänge, S. (2023). Start-up collaboration units as knowledge brokers in corporate innovation ecosystems: A study in the automotive industry. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 8*(1), 100303.

Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2005). A leadership framework for cross-sector collaboration. *Public Management Review, 7*(2), 177–201.

Cross, R., Ehrlich, K., Dawson, R., & Helferich, J. (2008). Managing collaboration: Improving team effectiveness through a network perspective. *California Management Review, 50*(4), 74–98.

Crupi, A., Del Sarto, N., Di Minin, A., Phaal, R., & Piccaluga, A. (2021). Open innovation environments as knowledge sharing enablers: The case of strategic technology and innovative management consortium. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 25*(5), 1263–1286.

Cuvero, M., Granados, M. L., Pilkington, A., & Evans, R. (2023). Start-ups' use of knowledge spillovers for product innovation: The influence of entrepreneurial ecosystems and virtual platforms. *R&D Management, 53*(4), 584–602.

Dahesh, M. B., Tabarsa, G., Zandieh, M., & Hamidizadeh, M. (2020). Reviewing the intellectual structure and evolution of the innovation systems approach: A social network analysis. *Technology in Society, 63*, 101399.

Davis, J. P. (2016). The group dynamics of interorganizational relationships: Collaborating with multiple partners in innovation ecosystems. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 61*(4), 621–661.

De Wit-de Vries, E., Dolfsma, W. A., van der Windt, H. J., & Gerkema, M. P. (2019). Knowledge transfer in university–industry research partnerships: A review. *The Journal of Technology Transfer, 44*, 1236–1255.

Del Giudice, M., Carayannis, E. G., & Della Peruta, M. R. (2011). *Cross-cultural knowledge management: Fostering innovation and collaboration inside the multicultural enterprise* (Vol. 11). Springer Science & Business Media.

Delgado, J. M. D., Oyedele, L., Ajayi, A., Akanbi, L., Akinade, O., Bilal, M., & Owolabi, H. (2019). Robotics and automated systems in construction: Understanding industry-specific challenges for adoption. *Journal of Building Engineering, 26*, 100868.

Della Porta, D. (2020). Building bridges: Social movements and civil society in times of crisis. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 31*(5), 938–948.

Dharmayanti, N., Ismail, T., Hanifah, I. A., & Taqi, M. (2023). Exploring sustainability management control system and eco-innovation matter sustainable financial performance: The role of supply chain management and digital adaptability in Indonesian context. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 9*(3), 100119.

Duffy, B. E., Poell, T., & Nieborg, D. B. (2019). Platform practices in the cultural industries: Creativity, labor, and citizenship. *Social Media+ Society, 5*(4), 2056305119879672.

Durugbo, C. (2016). Collaborative networks: A systematic review and multi-level framework. *International Journal of Production Research, 54*(12), 3749–3776.

Duxbury, N., Bakas, F. E., & Carvalho, C. P. (2023). Participatory knowledge co-production to activate culture in the development of small cities and rural areas in Portugal. *Social Enterprise Journal.*

Elia, G., Margherita, A., & Passiante, G. (2020). Digital entrepreneurship ecosystem: How digital technologies and collective intelligence are reshaping the entrepreneurial process. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 150*, 119791.

Fabiano, G., Marcellusi, A., & Favato, G. (2020). Channels and processes of knowledge transfer: How does knowledge move between university and industry? *Science and Public Policy, 47*(2), 256–270.

Ferreira, J. J., Fernandes, C. I., Veiga, P. M., & Dooley, L. (2023). The effects of entrepreneurial ecosystems, knowledge management capabilities, and knowledge spillovers on international open innovation. *R&D Management, 53*(2), 322–338.

Filieri, R., McNally, R. C., O'Dwyer, M., & O'Malley, L. (2014). Structural social capital evolution and knowledge transfer: Evidence from an Irish pharmaceutical network. *Industrial Marketing Management, 43*(3), 429–440.

Gann, D. (2001). Putting academic ideas into practice: Technological progress and the absorptive capacity of construction organizations. *Construction Management & Economics, 19*(3), 321–330.

Gao, C., & McDonald, R. (2022). Shaping nascent industries: Innovation strategy and regulatory uncertainty in personal genomics. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 67*(4), 915–967.

Gawer, A., & Cusumano, M. A. (2014). Industry platforms and ecosystem innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 31*(3), 417–433.

Gibson, C. B. (2017). Elaboration, generalization, triangulation, and interpretation: On enhancing the value of mixed method research. *Organizational Research Methods, 20*(2), 193–223.

Giffords, E. D., & Calderon, O. (2015). Academic and community collaborations: An exploration of benefits, barriers and successes. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance, 39*(4), 397–405.

Goldman, M. (2012). The innovative medicines initiative: A European response to the innovation challenge. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 91*(3), 418–425.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology, 78*(6), 1360–1380.

Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 17*(S2), 109–122.

Guerrero, M., Herrera, F., & Urbano, D. (2019). Strategic knowledge management within subsidised entrepreneurial university-industry partnerships. *Management Decision, 57*(12), 3280–3300.

Heath, R. G., & Frey, L. R. (2004). Ideal collaboration: A conceptual framework of community collaboration. In *Communication yearbook 28* (pp. 192–233). Routledge.

Hsu, M. H., Ju, T. L., Yen, C. H., & Chang, C. M. (2007). Knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: The relationship between trust, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 65*(2), 153–169.

Huntjens, P. (2021). *Towards a natural social contract: Transformative social-ecological innovation for a sustainable, healthy and just society* (p. 205). Springer Nature.

Ireta Sanchez, J. M. (2023). Attributes of scaling up SMEs in the IT sector towards sustaining high-performance business results. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 15*(5), 910–944.

Järvi, K., Almpanopoulou, A., & Ritala, P. (2018). Organization of knowledge ecosystems: Prefigurative and partial forms. *Research Policy, 47*(8), 1523–1537.

Keane, C., & Costin, Y. (2019). Collaboration in an entrepreneurial cluster: A study of an urban coop. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy, 13*(5), 605–624.

Khan, A., & Tao, M. (2022). Knowledge absorption capacity's efficacy to enhance innovation performance through big data analytics and digital platform capability. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 7*(3), 100201.

Kikoski, C., & Kikoski, J. (2004). *The inquiring organization: Tacit knowledge, conversation, and knowledge creation: Skills for 21st-century organizations*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

Klein, J. T. (2021). Building capacity for transformative learning: lessons from crossdisciplinary and cross-sector education and research. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 1–14.

Koch, K. (2018). Geopolitics of cross-border cooperation at the EU's external borders: Discourses of de- and re-bordering, territorial perceptions and actor relations within the Finnish-Russian ENI cooperation network. *Nordia Geographical publications, 47*(1).

Köhler, J., Sönnichsen, S. D., & Beske-Jansen, P. (2022). Towards a collaboration framework for circular economy: The role of dynamic capabilities and open innovation. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 31*(6), 2700–2713.

Kolade, O., Adegbile, A., & Sarpong, D. (2022). Can university-industry-government collaborations drive a 3D printing revolution in Africa? A triple helix model of technological leapfrogging in additive manufacturing. *Technology in Society, 69*, 101960.

Kotiranta, A., Tahvanainen, A., Kovalainen, A., & Poutanen, S. (2020). Forms and varieties of research and industry collaboration across disciplines. *Heliyon*, *6*(3).

Lager, T. (2017). A conceptual analysis of conditions for innovation in the process industries and a guiding framework for industry collaboration and further research. *International Journal of Technological Learning, Innovation and Development, 9*(3), 189–219.

Lawrence, T. B., & Shadnam, M. (2008). Institutional theory. *The international encyclopedia of communication*.

Lütjen, H., Schultz, C., Tietze, F., & Urmetzer, F. (2019). Managing ecosystems for service innovation: A dynamic capability view. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 506–519.

Morrison-Smith, S., & Ruiz, J. (2020). Challenges and barriers in virtual teams: A literature review. *SN Applied Sciences, 2*, 1–33.

Mu, J., Tang, F., & MacLachlan, D. L. (2010). Absorptive and disseminative capacity: Knowledge transfer in intra-organization networks. *Expert Systems with Applications, 37*(1), 31–38.

Nawaz, W., & Koç, M. (2020). *Industry, university and government partnerships for the sustainable development of knowledge-based society*. Springer.

Nippa, M., & Reuer, J. J. (2019). On the future of international joint venture research. *Journal of International Business Studies, 50*, 555–597.

Nooteboom, B., Van Haverbeke, W., Duysters, G., Gilsing, V., & Van den Oord, A. (2007). Optimal cognitive distance and absorptive capacity. *Research Policy, 36*(7), 1016–1034.

Noviaristanti, S., Acur, N., & Mendibil, K. (2023). The different roles of innovation intermediaries to generate value. *Management Review Quarterly*, 1–33.

Nowell, B. (2009). Profiling capacity for coordination and systems change: The relative contribution of stakeholder relationships in interorganizational collaboratives. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 44*, 196–212.

O'Dwyer, M., Filieri, R., & O'Malley, L. (2023). Establishing successful university–industry collaborations: Barriers and enablers deconstructed. *The Journal of Technology Transfer, 48*(3), 900–931.

Oguamanam, C. (2013). *Intellectual property in global governance: A development question*. Routledge.

Olk, P., & West, J. (2020). The relationship of industry structure to open innovation: Cooperative value creation in pharmaceutical consortia. *R&D Management, 50*(1), 116–135.

Pagano, A., Carloni, E., Galvani, S., & Bocconcelli, R. (2021). The dissemination mechanisms of Industry 4.0 knowledge in traditional industrial districts Evidence: from Italy. *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal, 31*(1), 27–53.

Pak, Y. S., & Lee, J. M. (2023). Organizational learning platforms for knowledge creation in international joint ventures: The mediating role of formal and informal communication. *Asian Business & Management*, 1–29.

Pandiarajan, V. (2022). *Business innovation: A case study approach*. Routledge.

Paruchuri, S., & Awate, S. (2017). Organizational knowledge networks and local search: The role of intra-organizational inventor networks. *Strategic Management Journal, 38*(3), 657–675.

Proeger, T. (2020). Knowledge spillovers and absorptive capacity—Institutional evidence from the 'German Mittelstand.' *Journal of the Knowledge Economy, 11*, 211–238.

Prokop, V., & Stejskal, J. (2018). The effects of cooperation and knowledge spillovers in knowledge environment. *Knowledge spillovers in regional innovation systems: A case study of CEE regions*, 3–46.

Radziwon, A., & Bogers, M. (2019). Open innovation in SMEs: Exploring inter-organizational relationships in an ecosystem. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 146*, 573–587.

Reeves, M., & Pidun, U. (Eds.). (2022). *Business ecosystems*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Rehm, S. V., & Goel, L. (2015). The emergence of boundary clusters in inter-organizational innovation. *Information and Organization, 25*(1), 27–51.

Rejeb, A., Rejeb, K., Simske, S., & Keogh, J. G. (2023). Exploring blockchain research in supply chain management: A latent Dirichlet allocation-driven systematic review. *Information, 14*(10), 557.

Remko, V. H. (2020). Research opportunities for a more resilient post-COVID-19 supply chain–closing the gap between research findings and industry practice. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 40*(4), 341–355.

Reypens, C., Lievens, A., & Blazevic, V. (2016). Leveraging value in multi-stakeholder innovation networks: A process framework for value co-creation and capture. *Industrial Marketing Management, 56*, 40–50.

Ritala, P., & Stefan, I. (2021). A paradox within the paradox of openness: The knowledge leveraging conundrum in open innovation. *Industrial Marketing Management, 93*, 281–292.

Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous technological change. *Journal of Political Economy*, *98*(5, Part 2), S71-S102.

Rong, K., Lin, Y., Yu, J., Zhang, Y., & Radziwon, A. (2022). Exploring regional innovation ecosystems: an empirical study in China. In *Innovation Policies and Practices within Innovation Ecosystems* (pp. 10–34). Routledge.

Russell, M. G., & Smorodinskaya, N. V. (2018). Leveraging complexity for ecosystemic innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 136*, 114–131.

Santoro, F. M., Borges, M. R., & Rezende, E. A. (2006). Collaboration and knowledge sharing in network organizations. *Expert Systems with Applications, 31*(4), 715–727.

Secundo, G., Toma, A., Schiuma, G., & Passiante, G. (2019). Knowledge transfer in open innovation: A classification framework for healthcare ecosystems. *Business Process Management Journal, 25*(1), 144–163.

Sehnem, S., Provensi, T., da Silva, T. H. H., & Pereira, S. C. F. (2022). Disruptive innovation and circularity in start-ups: A path to sustainable development. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 31*(4), 1292–1307.

Serenko, A., & Bontis, N. (2022). Global ranking of knowledge management and intellectual capital academic journals: A 2021 update. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 26*(1), 126–145.

Sharma, S. K., & Meyer, K. E. (2019). *Industrializing innovation-the next revolution*. Springer International Publishing.

Sierzchula, W., Bakker, S., Maat, K., & Van Wee, B. (2012). Technological diversity of emerging eco-innovations: A case study of the automobile industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 37*, 211–220.
Srisathan, W. A., Ketkaew, C., & Naruetharadhol, P. (2023). Assessing the effectiveness of open innovation implementation strategies in the promotion of ambidextrous innovation in Thai small and medium-sized enterprises. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 8*(4), 100418.
Thirumalesh Madanaguli, A., Kaur, P., Bresciani, S., & Dhir, A. (2021). Entrepreneurship in rural hospitality and tourism. A systematic literature review of past achievements and future promises. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 33*(8), 2521–2558.
Turner, S. F., Cardinal, L. B., & Burton, R. M. (2017). Research design for mixed methods: A triangulation-based framework and roadmap. *Organizational Research Methods, 20*(2), 243–267.
Vaccaro, A., Veloso, F., & Brusoni, S. (2009). The impact of virtual technologies on knowledge-based processes: An empirical study. *Research Policy, 38*(8), 1278–1287.
Villani, E., & Phillips, N. (2021). Formal organizations and interstitial spaces: Catalysts, complexity, and the initiation of cross-field collaboration. *Strategic Organization, 19*(1), 5–36.
Visnjic, I., Neely, A., Cennamo, C., & Visnjic, N. (2016). Governing the city: Unleashing value from the business ecosystem. *California Management Review, 59*(1), 109–140.
Weiss, K., Hamann, M., Kinney, M., & Marsh, H. (2012). Knowledge exchange and policy influence in a marine resource governance network. *Global Environmental Change, 22*(1), 178–188.
Wright, M., Tartari, V., Huang, K. G., Di Lorenzo, F., & Bercovitz, J. (2018). Knowledge worker mobility in context: Pushing the boundaries of theory and methods. *Journal of Management Studies, 55*(1), 1–26.
Ye, Y., & Crispeels, T. (2022). The role of former collaborations in strengthening interorganizational links: Evidence from the evolution of the Chinese innovation network. *The Journal of Technology Transfer, 47*(5), 1343–1372.
Yli-Renko, H., Autio, E., & Sapienza, H. J. (2001). Social capital, knowledge acquisition, and knowledge exploitation in young technology-based firms. *Strategic Management Journal, 22*(6–7), 587–613.
Zahoor, N., & Al-Tabbaa, O. (2020). Inter-organizational collaboration and SMEs' innovation: A systematic review and future research directions. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 36*(2), 101109.
Zeng, J., Glaister, K. W., & Darwish, T. (2019). Processes underlying MNE subsidiary absorptive capacity: Evidence from emerging markets. *Management International Review, 59*, 949–979.
Zheng, W., Yang, B., & McLean, G. N. (2010). Linking organizational culture, structure, strategy, and organizational effectiveness: Mediating role of knowledge management. *Journal of Business Research, 63*(7), 763–771.